



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

1
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/735,352	12/11/2003	Matt D. Pursley	PUR-020	3757
26821	7590	08/24/2007	EXAMINER	
THOMPSON & THOMPSON, P.A. P.O BOX 166 SCANDIA, KS 66966			TENTONI, LEO B	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1732		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		08/24/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/735,352	PURSLEY, MATT D.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Leo B. Tentoni	1732

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 June 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 2,3,5,6,24,28,29,31,32,36,37 and 51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 2, 3, 5, 6, 24, 28, 29, 31, 32, 36, 37 and 51 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 28, 24 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zantonelli et al (U.S. Patent 4,952,312 A) in combination with Clint (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0044633 A1).

Zantonelli et al (see the entire document, in particular, col. 4, line 23 to col. 6, line 19) teaches a process as claimed, except for the aspect of winding a group of filaments, which is taught by Clint (see the entire document, in particular, paragraphs [0015], [0020] and [0065]) and such would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made in the process of Zantonelli et al in view of Clint principally in order to provide a product having uniform and well-defined characteristics.

Art Unit: 1732

3. Claims 2, 3, 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zantonelli et al (U.S. Patent 4,952,312 A) in combination with Clint (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0044633 A1) as applied to claims 28, 24 and 29 above, and further in view of Sarge et al (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0041881 A1).

Sarge et al (see the entire document, in particular, paragraphs [0011], [0063] - [0067] and [0080]) teaches the claimed limitations and such would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made in the process of Zantonelli et al in view of Sarge et al principally in order to manufacture a product having desired performance features.

4. Claims 36, 31, 32 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zantonelli et al (U.S. Patent 4,952,312 A) in combination with Clint (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0044633 A1).

Zantonelli et al (see the entire document, in particular, col. 4, line 23 to col. 6, line 19) teaches a process as claimed, except for the aspect of winding a group of filaments, which is taught by Clint (see the entire document, in particular, paragraphs [0015], [0020] and [0065]) and such would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made in the process of Zantonelli et al in view of Clint principally in order to provide a product having uniform and well-defined characteristics.

5. Claim 51 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zantonelli et al (U.S. Patent 4,952,312 A) in combination with Clint (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0044633 A1) and Sarge et al (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0041881 A1).

Zantonelli et al (see the entire document, in particular, col. 4, line 23 to col. 6, line 19) teaches a process as claimed, except for the aspects of winding a group of filaments and anchoring a group of filaments. Clint (see the entire document, in particular, paragraphs [0015], [0020] and [0065]) teaches a process including the step of winding a group of filaments and such would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made in the process of Zantonelli et al in view of Clint principally in order to provide a product having uniform and well-defined characteristics. Sarge et al (see the entire document, in particular, paragraphs [0011], [0063] - [0067] and [0080]) teaches a process including anchoring a group of filaments and such would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made in the process of Zantonelli

Art Unit: 1732

et al in view of Sarge et al principally in order to manufacture a product having desired performance features.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 24, 28, 29, 31, 32, 36, 37 and 51 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leo B. Tentoni whose telephone number is (571) 272-1209. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (6:30 A.M. - 3:00 P.M.).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina A. Johnson can be reached on (571) 272-1176. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1732

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Leo B. Tentoni
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1732

lbt